Arms and Explosives

Number of licences granted in Cuddapah district from 1910—20.

*359 *Q.*—Mr. A. PARASURAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of licences granted under the Arms Act in the Cuddapah district in the last decade (1910—20) and subsequently till 1928; and

(*b*) the reasons for the decrease, if any?

A.—(*a*) The number is as shown below:—

Year.	Number of licences in force.	Year.	Number of licences in force.
1910	2,710	1919	1,279
1911	1,337	1920	1,421
1912	1,292	1921	1,404
1913	1,267	1922	1,589
1914	1,224	1923	1,562
1915	1,230	1924	1,674
1916	1,285	1925	1,702
1917	1,211	1926	1,726
1918	1,271	1927	1,802

(*b*) The decrease in 1911 and 1912 was due partly to the transfer of Madanapalle and Vayalpad taluks to Chittoor district and partly to the cancellation in 1912 of many licences owing to a number of riots in which the licensees were concerned. The variations in other years do not seem to call for any special explanation.

European Education

Exemption of European and Anglo-Indian girls from payment of school fees.

*360 *Q.*—Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that he called for a list of poor girls studying in European and Anglo-Indian girls' schools in some of the districts and exempted them from payment of school-fees; and

(*b*) if so, what is the amount involved thereby?

A.—(*a*) The answer is in the negative.

(*b*) Does not arise

Labour

Intervention of Government in the settlement of the South Indian Railway strike.

*361 *Q.*—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) why the Labour Commissioner did not do anything during the whole period of the Railway strike to settle the dispute and why he did not go even to Trichinopoly;

(*b*) why the hon. the Home Member himself as Member in charge of the portfolio did not take any part in settling the strike or even visit Trichinopoly;

(*c*) why the Chief Secretary and the Military Secretary went there;

(*d*) the extent and the nature of the work done by them there, and whether they submitted any report to the Government;

(*e*) whether their reports will be placed on the table of the House; and if not, why not; and

(*f*) whether the Government propose to take any action to settle the points of dispute between the railway authorities and the railway workmen, and if not, why not?

A.—(*a*), (*b*) & (*f*) The hon. Member is referred to the Press Communiqué dated the 31st August 1928, which has been placed on the table.

(*c*) Postal communication being delayed by the strike, and it being difficult to obtain details by telegram, the Chief Secretary went to Trichinopoly by motor car on 23rd July 1928 and the Military Secretary went with him to bring back to His Excellency the Governor at once such details as were immediately available in case the Chief Secretary found it advisable to stay at Trichinopoly for a day or two longer.

(*d*) The Military Secretary returned by motor car on 25th July 1928 with a summary of events drawn up by the Deputy Inspector-General of Railway Police. The Chief Secretary returned by motor car on 26th July 1928 with information as to the measures proposed by the Inspector-General of Police for safeguarding the running of trains and the prevention of offences and prosecution of offenders. These reports placed the Government in possession of the facts relating to the situation earlier than it would have been possible had they depended on the postal service alone.

(*e*) The two officers made no reports of their own.

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Sir, may I know the specific reason why the Labour Commissioner did not take any steps with regard to the settling of the railway strike?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" On account of the fact that both the parties were not agreeable to it."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" In that case, Sir, may I know why the Chief Secretary and the Military Secretary went to Trichinopoly, if there was no possibility of settling the strike?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" In order to find out the exact nature of the situation."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" For the information of the Government or with a view to settle the dispute?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" For the information of the Government."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Did the Government intend to take any action on that information, Sir, or was it merely to be kept in their own archives?"

8th October 1928]

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—
"To take action with regard to acts of violence and sabotage."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"Therefore the enquiry by the Chief Secretary and the Military Secretary was for the purpose of enabling the Government to enforce law and order?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—
"Yes."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"And not to interfere in the settlement of the labour dispute?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"As a result we were able to find out that both the parties were not agreeable to allow the Labour Commissioner's interference."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"The answer to clause (*d*) is that both the Chief Secretary and the Military Secretary 'returned with information as to the measures proposed . . . for safeguarding the running of trains, etc.' 'These reports placed the Government in possession of the facts relating to the situation earlier than it would have been possible had they depended on the postal service alone.' My question is in clause (*e*) 'whether their reports will be placed on the table of the House' and the answer to that is 'The two officers made no reports of their own.' But it is said in answer to clause (*d*) 'these reports placed the Government in possession of the facts.' May I know what is the explanation for this inconsistency?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—
"There were no reports submitted by either the Chief Secretary or the Military Secretary; but there were certain informal conferences that took place between the Railway authorities and the Chief Secretary and the minutes of these conferences were placed before the Government."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"Therefore they have placed the written minutes of those conferences before the Government?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—
"Yes."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"May I know then why the Government do not want to place their reports on the table of the House, such as they are?"

The hon. Khan Bahhdur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—
"They were of a confidential nature and so the Government do not want to place them on the table of the House."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"The hon. the Home Member said that the Labour Commissioner did not take any part in the settlement of the strike because the two parties were not agreeable to that. I want to know on what basis he says that. Did the Labour Commissioner approach the two parties, did he make any efforts to bring about a reconciliation, or did he do anything else."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"All those circumstances are mentioned in the communiqué that was issued."

11-15 a.m. Mr. ABDUL HAMID KHAN :—"From the answer given by the hon. the Home Member, one has to understand that the Labour Commissioner is not to interfere in cases where either the labour or the company is wrong. May I know from the hon. the Home Member if such an occasion arose, is it not the duty of the Labour Commissioner to interfere on behalf of either of the parties?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"I am afraid it is a hypothetical question."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"In answer to the supplementary question by my hon. Friend from Bellary, the Government referred him to this communiqué. Referring to that communiqué issued by the Government on the 31st August 1928, may I know whether the facts related in paragraph 6 of that communiqué were ascertained by the Government over the head of the Labour Commissioner or whether the Labour Commissioner wrote or put himself in communication with the Railway authorities or the Labour authorities?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"I want notice, Sir."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—"May I know whether the Labour Commissioner did not attempt to do anything more than attempt at arbitration and whether he moved no further than that? May I know if that is what the Labour Commissioner did in this matter?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"The Labour Commissioner was ready to intervene if both the parties agreed, but there was not agreement between the parties."

Police

Alleged motor crash near Trichinopoly.

*362 Q.—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to place before the Council a full report about the crash near Trichinopoly between a railway train engine and a bus, showing the circumstances under which the crash took place, the number of the injured and killed, the part taken by the police, the circumstances under which and the reasons for which the Police are alleged to have attacked and fired on the mob that had gathered, and the number killed and injured as a result of such firing?

A.—On the 20th July 1928, the general strike of the menials of the South Indian Railway began. As a result of it, keepers of railway gates between Trichinopoly Junction and Trichinopoly Fort and Trichinopoly Junction and Golden Rock stations deserted their posts. Some Anglo-Indians were temporarily put to man these gates but the mob interfered with them. The Railway Administration could not find any one to work the gates and therefore had to remove them. One of these gates so removed was at Comerford level crossing between Trichinopoly Junction and Palakarai stations.